

74/68

c

The Bancroft Library/Berkeley University of California
Regional Oral History Office

University History Series

Joseph R. Mixer

STUDENT HOUSING, WELFARE,

AND THE ASUC --

WITH A LOOK AT THE UNIVERSITY'S

FUTURE

An Interview Conducted by
Harriet Nathan



Joseph R. Mixer

TABLE OF CONTENTS -- Joseph R. Mixer

INTRODUCTION	i
<u>CAMPUS INTERESTS AND STUDENT WELFARE</u>	1
<u>Consumers' Council, ASUC</u>	1
<u>Stiles Hall, YMCA</u>	2
<u>Fair Bear and Clean Bear</u>	5
<u>The Problem of Student Housing</u>	7
<u>The Co-ops</u>	8
<u>Some Faculty Members</u>	9
<u>ASUC Presidency</u>	13
<u>The On-Campus Environment and Student Housing</u>	16
<u>Adults on the ASUC Executive Committee</u>	21
<u>Issues of Concern</u>	23
<u>FREE SPEECH AT SATHER GATE</u>	25
<u>About-Face of the Young Communist Groups</u>	27
<u>Moral Concerns and Political Issues</u>	28
<u>The Ban on Political Speech</u>	29
<u>The Kerr Rules on Free Speech</u>	30
<u>INTERPRETING THE CAMPUS TO THE COMMUNITY</u>	32
<u>The Use of Vignettes</u>	33
<u>The Nature of a University</u>	37
<u>Faculty Attitudes</u>	39
<u>The Darwinian Age in the Social Sciences</u>	41
<u>The Body Politic in a Changing State</u>	44
<u>Reaching Out</u>	45
<u>THE UNIVERSITY'S CENTENNIAL FUND</u>	50
<u>The Factors of Growth and Rising Costs</u>	50
<u>The Need of Funds for Student Housing</u>	52
<u>The Idea Behind the Centennial Fund</u>	54
<u>Dream Projects and Student Needs</u>	55
<u>From \$45 Million to \$15 Million</u>	56
<u>The Student Advisory Committee</u>	58
<u>Enlisting and Educating the Alumni</u>	60

<u>The Concerns of the Private Institutions</u>	61
<u>Sources of Support</u>	65
 <u>THE CAMPUS ROLE OF STUDENT RELIGIOUS GROUPS</u>	
<u>The Gus Hall Controversy</u>	71
<u>Community Activities and Race Relations</u>	72
<u>The Gift of the Japanese Women's Student Club</u>	76
<u>Some Restrictions on Scholarships</u>	77
<u>New Programs and Curricula</u>	80
 <u>THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS FUTURE</u>	
<u>Costs and the Leadership Position</u>	85
<u>Funds for Student Aid</u>	87
<u>Slowdown in the Growth Rate</u>	90
<u>Priorities and Effectiveness</u>	91
<u>The Significance of Private Funding</u>	94
<u>Limitations on State Support</u>	98
<u>Flexibility: Challenges and Problems</u>	99
 INDEX	104

INTRODUCTION

Joseph Mixer has a nearly unique perspective on the University of California. In the early '40s he was a campus politician in his undergraduate days, one who maintained close ties with the student co-op and the YMCA and learned to deal with problems of student housing, race relations, and the current brand of student activism. More recently as Gifts and Endowments Officer, he has thought deeply about the function and future of the University, and has sought to interpret them to the alumni, the California community, and to elements of the University itself.

There were three one-and-a-half-hour interviews at his campus office: the first two on October 4 and October 18, 1968; the last on June 11, 1971. The 1968 interviews followed the themes of student housing, welfare and the ASUC, as did the companion interview with Marguerite Johnston in this volume. By the time of the third Mixer interview, nearly three years later, the campus was somewhat quieter, and the University was facing a new reality, sensed rather than understood by the campus community. It is the context of the '70s and his view of the future that Mr. Mixer discusses with sympathy and clarity in his third interview.

He reviewed and approved the interviews, taking time from writing a Ph.D. dissertation to complete details. The memoir is part of the University History series supported by a grant from the Alumni Foundation, and is produced under the direction of the Office Head, Mrs. Willa Baum. Other housing-related interviews include those with Mary B. Davidson, Dean of Women; Ruth N. Donnelly, Supervisor of Housing Services; and Jean C. Witter, Regent and President of the Alumni Association.

The tone of the Mixer interviews was relaxed, reminiscent, and thoughtful. He provided a demonstration of resourcefulness in an episode when the tape recorder unexpectedly stopped. With scarcely a pause, he pulled out his office recorder, held the microphone through the subsequent hour-long conversation, and then brought the interview to an easy and successful conclusion.

Harriet Nathan
Interviewer

January, 1973
Regional Oral History Office
Room 486 The Bancroft Library
University of California
Berkeley, California

CAMPUS INTERESTS AND STUDENT WELFARE
(Interview 1 -- October 4, 1968)

Consumers' Council, ASUC

Nathan: What were some of your campus interests in the early '40's?

Mixer: When I was active in the student government back in 1941, I got interested in the Welfare Council and its various subcommittees, one of which was student housing; another was student labor board; the other was the health board -- the student health council. A fourth was student relations and then, while I served only for a short time on the student housing board, I got more active with Welfare Council by starting up and initiating the Consumer's Council. You'll recall at that point we were at war and the federal government had a program to encourage more effective consuming by all of the populace. One of their programs was to attempt to create consumer consciousness in terms of utilization of items among students and so we started this committee; its purpose was to carry on publicity about careful and cautious consuming at the time.

Nathan: This would have been about 1942 when you got the

Nathan: program started?

Mixer: Yes, yes it was in 1942.

Nathan: Was this a part of the ASUC structure?

Mixer: Yes it was. At that point in time, there was an Executive Committee which was the overall governing board. Then reporting to it was the Welfare Council and below the Welfare Council in the pyramid or table of organization were these various subcommittees. Then after serving on that for a period of time I became chairman of the Welfare Council.

Stiles Hall, YMCA

Mixer: Then in the meantime, I was also quite active in the student YMCA, Stiles Hall. I think a great deal of the interest in social issues and activities at that period from 1939 through '44 grew out of much of the leadership that was in and around and about Stiles Hall.

Nathan: Would this be Harry Kingman?

Mixer: Harry Kingman's and Bill Davis's influence. Now, some were not, of course, but others were quite active. Ralph Fisher was Student Body President in 1942 and he was active in Stiles. Glenn

Mixer: Slaughter was Welfare Council Chairman preceding me and he was active in Stiles. There were others who came and were involved with it, and it had quite an important impact. Of course, there was a carry forward from the Depression era and our concerns with social issues at that time.

We, during the early war years, were kind of the last of the socially conscious group on the campus, and I recall in my final months in University student government that the students were not nearly as socially concerned about issues as they were about the war and their interest was, of course, subverted and all consumed by the issues of the war. We lost a lot of effectiveness and a lot of good leadership, primarily because a lot of leaders were drafted and taken off with the men.

Nathan: Yes. Can we go back a moment to the Consumers' Council? How did you go about trying to educate the members of the student body?

Mixer: As I recall there were a number of materials, releases, posters, exhibits, that were furnished by the Office of Consumer Affairs (I believe it was in federal government), and there was a representative from the federal government who came over and visited with us and we used their

Mixer: materials, activities.

We had campaigns to save toothpaste tubes, to save tin cans and to save paper and save fats and all those things that the general community was doing but we instituted these kinds of efforts among the student body. I must say I can't be impressed by the results we achieved.

We tried.

Nathan: Yes, and it was the thing to do at the time.

Mixer: Yes, sure, but that was only one of the many activities on campus, of course, because there were all the standard activities which you know about, the Daily Cal, all the fraternities and sororities, the class groups. One thing and another.

Nathan: You became interested in the welfare aspects of student activities through the influence of the people around the YMCA?

Mixer: Yes, very definitely, as a matter of fact.

Nathan: Had you been interested in these problems before you came to the campus?

Mixer: No. Well, I was generally interested in world and public affairs, community affairs, but no, I didn't get the keen sense of the human issues, the human values involved in these issues until I came to the University.

Nathan: What was your home town?

Mixer: Riverside was my home. It's interesting that when I was a high school student I attended the Boys' State which was sponsored by the American Legion. I believe it still is, but it may be sponsored by the YMCA's now. At Boys' State I met and worked with a fellow named Jim Grant who helped me get elected speaker of the assembly. He was a year ahead of me. When I came to Cal, he looked me up, he got me started in Stiles Hall and then in student government.

At the present time he's in Washington, D.C. as the Assistant Administrator for USAID for Vietnam. He speaks Chinese fluently, was born and raised in China. His father was a businessman out there and an entrepreneur, and he was very active in China during World War II, and has been with the State Department now for a number of years since the war.

Fair Bear and Clean Bear

Nathan: Right. Well, in this whole complex of Welfare Council activities, the labor board, I take it, dealt with student wages.

Mixer: Yes, they had what they called Fair Bear wages

Mixer: and those stores, shops, and businesses which had met the minimum student wage (when I came to Cal it was 25 cents an hour, and it was subsequently raised, I think, to 40 cents an hour while I was there), would be allowed to display the Fair Bear placard in their store windows. We endeavored to get the students to patronize only Fair Bear stores. This was true, that the Student Health Council had an important function, going around inspecting living groups and restaurants and they developed a Clean Bear Sign that was posted in the restaurants. We attempted through the Daily Cal, and speaking to living groups, to alert the students to patronize only those stores which cooperated in this effort. There was quite a resistance among the entrepreneurs around Berkeley at this imposition of student interest and control.

Nathan: Student power 20 years ago.

Mixer: Yes, it was, it definitely was. There was some concerted campaign just prior to my activity, I think in late '39 and the early '40s before I was active in student government. I came in the Fall of '40 to Cal.

I heard the older students, older to me at that time, talking about these campaigns that they had waged to get given businesses and local

Mixer: businessmen to cave in and support the minimum standards for wages or cleanliness and so on.

The Student Relations Committee was quite concerned with suitable race relations. They were concerned with discrimination in all facets. One of the major areas, I think, was in the use of stereotypes about races. They had some other activities that I'm not too clear about because I was not active in that particular committee of welfare.

The Problem of Student Housing

Nathan: Did you then become interested in the housing problem?

Mixer: Yes, yes, and personally from my own experience. I came to Cal, and I joined a fraternity. The first year I lived in a fraternity on the north side and then in my Sophomore year I got permission to leave the fraternity, reluctantly on their part, and I went to live in a student co-op, Oxford Hall.

Nathan: You were in Oxford Hall?

Mixer: At first I couldn't get into Oxford. The first few weeks of the semester I was living in a rooming

Mixer: house, and I can remember quite vividly how dumpy it was, and the extremely poor furniture. In fact the mattress and the beds were quite a concave shape. They just were lousy beds and fixtures. I had a roommate and he had something wrong with him, but anyhow the first night I was there he vomited all night and that was my introduction to private housing around the campus. It made quite an impression.

The Co-ops

Mixer: The co-ops had a very interesting group of people, and were much as I understand them to be today, quite diversified in the makeup of their members, coming from all types of backgrounds, but, of course, primarily low income backgrounds; but of all different races, from all different parts of the country, all different political viewpoints. It was here that I got introduced to some quite different viewpoints, politically and socially. But it was a good mixture of people and the houses seemed to do well.

There were a number of us interested in making them more effective, and it was the beginning

Mixer: of the time when it was important for student and campus leaders, if they wanted to be elected to a student office, to have that background in the non-org areas. The co-ops being the largest of the "non-orgs," meaning non-fraternity/sorority, had _____ great political power because the commuter students had no dormitories and no other non-fraternity groups that were organized so they could lean on them for support.

Nathan: I suppose Bowles Hall was really the only one of this type of independent dorm.

Mixer: Yes, Bowles Hall and Stern. And they were very important.

Nathan: Was Stern operating then?

Mixer: Yes, yes it was. It had just been built. I believe it was completed in 1939 -- the first unit of it was completed in '39; it was expanded later after the war.

Some Faculty Members

Nathan: Before we get you into the ASUC presidency, I might ask you about some of the faculty people. Did you know anyone individually?

Mixer: Oh yes. One of my first contacts with the faculty

Mixer: was with Professor Robert Stone. He had a group of freshmen as his advisory group.

Nathan: What was his field?

Mixer: Business Law; Law and Business Administration. He taught Business Law for many years. I got to know him before I came to know his two sons, one of whom was a contemporary of mine, Al Stone, who is now Dean of the Law School, University of Montana.

Professor Stone invited all of his advisees to an evening dessert party at his home up near the Claremont Hotel. I was greatly impressed by this. The cordiality of him, his warm human interest, the ease with which he and his wife made students feel at home and know that someone on the campus of importance was interested in them -- it had a great effect on my student life. He only had two parties, but they were such highlights. There was a second one in the following semester, and I still look back on them. I can still recall sitting on his veranda with a whole bunch of students around me. We discussed all kinds of issues and activities at that time; student life and the world, contemporary problems. Various subjects, it was quite impressive.

Nathan: It was a rather large group, wasn't it?

Mixer: Yes, about 20, well, at least 20 students if not

Mixer: more. I guess he paid for it all out of his own pocket. So, I developed a life-long friendship with him, which was not a close friendship because we were separated geographically on many occasions, but I always saw him, and stopped in to see him during my college career. I knew his sons. Then when I was at Ohio State getting a Master's Degree, he came there as a visiting professor, and I resumed acquaintanceship with him there.

Nathan: What was your field?

Mixer: I was in Economics at Cal and then Business Administration at Ohio State.

Nathan: Were there any people from whom you took instruction that made any particular impression on you?

Mixer: Of course, Ira B. Cross. Everyone remembers him, many alumni today still ask me if he's alive, and, of course, he is and quite a sharp, alert gent. I recall any number of people.

There was Ed Strong, who later hired me to become gift officer for the campus. I had him for Philosophy 6A. I had the Dean in Political Science, Eric Bellquist, (he was a professor of Political Science), had many discussions with him. I later got to know him when he was Dean of Students -- acting, in the Dean's Office. The

Mixer: professor of Geography at the time was a Dutchman, I believe his name was Bower or Gower, and I was greatly impressed with him. Another person who made a significant impact on me in his thinking was Professor Monk, who is now at Reed College, emeritus by this time. He was a refugee from Czechoslovakia. I took a course from him primarily because I'd heard him speak at Stiles Hall on his problems of fleeing from the Nazis and out of Czechoslovakia. He had been Minister of Finance in Czechoslovakia. A very learned and educated, warm, human person. He was just great. His lectures were quite good.

And of course, J. B. Condliffe was always a character on campus with his very erudite and complicated international monetary lectures. I remember the professor of transportation, Professor Daggett, Stuart Daggett. He was kind of the epitome of the Professor Chips, with his tweed coat and his sweater; I think at times he had a bow tie, and his crushed fedora. He'd wear everything into class and lecture; sometimes he would or wouldn't remove his hat, and he was just the epitome of the typical old time professorial people.

Nathan: Did you have a clue at that time that you would come back to the University?

Mixer: No. While I was greatly interested in the University and its operation of activities, I was interested in working in the business community, in the big world. But I had such a wonderful and fine experience with the student Y that coming out of the war I felt that I was lucky to survive the war, so I devoted the next three years of my life to being a secretary of the student Y. It was at Ohio State, it was at the time that I got my Master's degree in Business Administration.

ASUC Presidency

Nathan: Turning back a bit to your undergraduate years at Berkeley, was your political base in the co-op housing?

Mixer: No, primarily the Y, the student Y and the co-ops and then later on I returned to my fraternity, became president of my fraternity, and then I ran for student office.

Nathan: How did you decide you wanted to run for ASUC President?

Mixer: Well, I recall hearing John McPherson, who was student body president when I entered Cal. He was a very persuasive, personable young man. His first

Mixer: speech to the incoming Freshmen group made a lasting impression on me.

Shortly thereafter, I vowed, one night, walking across the campus as a Freshman, looking up at the Campanile and being very impressed by all of it, that I wanted to be the top student leader of that campus. And so, three years later I was.

Nathan: Did you deliberately cultivate different groups on campus?

Mixer: Yes. It was a very conscious design to get to know as many campus groups as I could, to know as many people. I made a systematic practice of dating girls in many different sororities, so I'd know at least one girl in every sorority fairly well -- every living group. I think there were only just a very few that I didn't know.

I recall in designing the campaign, that I'd heard that one of the criteria was that you had to go through the student roster, and if you knew 25 percent of the students in there by name or could recognize their names, and knew who they were, you had a pretty good chance. Well, I knew about a half of them at the time. In some way I could identify them, knew of them, knew where they were, and so on.

Nathan: At that time there were what, 10 or 15 thousand

Nathan: students on campus?

Mixer: Yes. Of course, that was including graduate students, and I knew a great number of them. I remember checking off the student directory.

Nathan: So you ran, and who ran against you?

Mixer: Jack Block ran against me. He was active in a number of spirit groups and was a fraternity man. I've forgotten exactly what activities he was in. He was a class officer, I think his junior class president. He was quite active. At the present time he's permanent class president and I'm working with him, as a matter of fact, at this time to celebrate our 25th reunion on November 22 [1968].

Nathan: Did you have a platform or point of view when you ran?

Mixer: Yes, the general tenor of the platform that I had was a theory which I could never get across too well, but I dubbed it "social integration." It was my feeling that at that time the campus was large and impersonal, even then, for many students, and that much should be done and could be done, very easily, to develop a more personal, more intimate atmosphere. It's kind of interesting that today I'm raising funds in the millions of dollars for that very purpose and function. One of our major sections, or program areas of our

Mixer: \$15 million Berkeley Centennial Fund, was to create a more personalized campus.

I was interested in effective student participation in student government. Not many were concerned in those times in terms of the nature of curriculum, of course instruction as we find students today. We seemed to be, in my generation, more interested in the attitudes, the social consciousness of students, and their particular environment.

The On-Campus Environment and Student Housing

Nathan: You're thinking of the on-campus environment?

Mixer: On-campus environment, right, and the students' political consciousness as well -- in terms of their living accommodations, their housing accommodations. This leads up to the housing committee. There had been an extensive report prepared by a group, I believe, under the leadership of Doug North, who is now Professor of Economics, University of Washington. And Glenn Slaughter, Maggie Johnston, and several others.

Now, they may have been the second generation on this, but there was quite an extensive housing report prepared -- almost a Master's or Ph.D.

Mixer: thesis -- citing the tremendous lack of accommodations available for students, the distance students had to travel to find adequate housing, the high cost of housing relative to student income, and the undesirability of isolated student residences in rundown boarding houses around the campus, or rooming houses primarily. Some of the boarding houses were pretty good because they were student and campus inspected. The big impression that I had from these leaders, who were my seniors by one or two years, was the lack of reception of their report, or the lack of interest on the part of the administration and the Regents.

Nathan: Was this submitted to the administration?

Mixer: And to the Regents. It was my understanding that the document had worked all the way up through the administrative ladder and was indeed presented to the Regents, but I don't know the details of that. The records of the Regents may show, but there seemed to be considerable frustration on the part of those people older than I am about what this report had actually accomplished. We really didn't foresee the future, that three years later the tremendous dormitory program would start, but perhaps that may have had an impact.

Nathan: Do you remember what it was hoped that this report

Nathan: would accomplish?

Mixer: Oh, the commitment on the part of the University administration and the Regents to undertake University dormitory construction.

Nathan: It was specifically for that purpose?

Mixer: Yes, oh yes. That was my impression. It was designed to create University housing. The thing the students just couldn't understand was the lack of interest on the part of the administration and the Regents.

Nathan: At that time were you aware of the point of view of different individuals? Were you aware of President Sproul's point of view or Monroe Deutsch's point of view?

Mixer: Well, more Monroe Deutsch's point of view on all of these; I sensed that he had a sympathetic ear. I really wasn't too close to President Sproul. As a matter of fact I only saw him twice during my tenure as student body president. Which is amazing when you think of the amount of contact that a student body president of today has with the Chancellor, and with the President as a matter of fact. But it was war time, there was the great press for the building of the cyclotron up on the hill and the radiation laboratory development and the President was an extremely busy person. Now

Mixer: this was outside, I'm talking about personal private interviews, not connected with some public event or formal occasion.

Nathan: But just getting acquainted and exchanging views would be of interest, and this happened twice.

Mixer: Yes twice, but I had many more contacts with Monroe Deutsch whom I regarded as one of the great administrators from a student's point of view. I can't comment on his actual technical competency as an administrator, but on his relationship with students, his concerns and interests, understanding and ready willingness to talk.

Nathan: Let's continue with the discussion of student housing. Had you developed an interest in student housing problems as a result of your other contacts on the Welfare Board?

Mixer: No, I think it was really the other way around. Personal experience with the rooming house, which I think I mentioned.

Nathan: You described that horrible episode.

Mixer: And then I really became conscious of the concerns of students about housing through the co-ops. As an organization, the co-ops emphasized to their members and through their councils why they were in existence, and what they were trying to do, and in a sense did an indoctrination job of their

*(Interview 2 -- October 18, 1968)

Mixer: leadership group so that they would become aware as to why it was a co-op and not just an ordinary room and board place. So I think that really kind of awakened my interest in housing. I really can't say that I had a major interest in housing, otherwise I would have served on the Student Housing Board. But I was also, as I indicated to you, made aware of the reasons why nothing was available for students from the University in the way of housing other than the limited amount from Bowles and Stern Hall. That was due to the discussion about the investigation report which the Student Housing Board had compiled earlier. Now have you ever come across a copy of that?

Nathan: I have never seen a copy of it. I've seen very brief references to it, and that was all.

Mixer: Well, I suggest that either you talk again with Maggie Johnston as to who might have their hands on a copy, or you may write to Doug North at the University of Washington.

Nathan: Now this would be something separate from either the questionnaires of '40 or '43, or was that in conjunction with one of these? Do you recall that?

Mixer: No, I do not. It seemed to me that it was a very compendious volume which covered the whole aspect of student housing and was designed to advocate

Mixer: the construction of University student housing.

Adults on the ASUC Executive Committee

Nathan: Now on the Executive Committee at that time was there a faculty or administration representative?

Mixer: Oh yes, I recall the alumni representative.

Nathan: Who was it, do you remember?

Mixer: I should say I recall there was an alumni representative. I recall Dean Hurford Stone, as being the administrative representative. I recall the executive manager of the ASUC, who just prior to my time was Ken Priestly, and then replacing him was Clint Evans. Yes, Clint held that job after Ken Priestly. He was in the executive manager's job when I was student body president.

Nathan: Ken Priestly died and then Clint Evans stepped in.

Mixer: Yes, that's right. No, that's wrong, Ken Priestly left to go up to the Radiation Laboratory, to help them run that operation up there in 1943, the beginning of 1943. I had a very short tenure in office. I was elected in a normal process, but then we started the tri-semester system at that time, and I went through one semester only; and then I was graduated, and got my commission and went

Mixer: into the Navy in October '43. So I only served really as student body president for one semester, from June 20 at the end of the spring semester through the Fall tri-semester which was in October.

Nathan: You were part of that war-time speed up.

Mixer: Yes, so I got my full academic degree in three years and two months. Four years' work in three years and two months' time.

Nathan: When you were coming to decisions on the Executive Committee, what was the student view towards the academic representative and the administration?

Mixer: There was always a great suspicion on the part of the students of the adult representatives on there. As always, kind of wanting to keep the lid down, the clamps down, so I have a very keen understanding of the students today and their attitudes toward the older generation. We were quite concerned about their very conservative viewpoints, their lack of willingness to endorse or allow the student executive committee to take stands or positions on the issues, or endorse concerns about the war, about labor conditions, one thing and another.

Issues of Concern

Nathan: What sort of issues seemed to you to be particularly impressive at the time?

Mixer: Well, it's hard to say, I think the major issues were the allocation of funds. The one that I became involved with in the student government was the allocation of funds which enabled the various agencies to function effectively. For example, without suitable funds the Welfare Council would be limited, or the Daily Cal would be limited, or some of the others, and so this was an important issue, to get an adequate amount of funds.

In a sense there was competition among the various student groups, athletics versus publications, publications versus Welfare Council, and so on to gain adequate amounts of funds. This was one of the prime issues.

There was also continuing concern over the operation of the Book Store, should it be a co-op, pay dividends, was it really being run for the students, were all of the profits really coming into the student government at the time or not? The same kinds of issues today.

Nathan: Fascinating, isn't it?

Mixer: Yes, history repeats itself I'm sure. As Chancellor

Mixer: Heyns says, the thing we always forget is that every year the Freshman is still 18 years old. He hasn't matured, he's still a new 18 year old student, and the faculty and campus administrators have to recognize that.

FREE SPEECH AT SATHER GATE

Nathan: I was recalling your interest in a couple of other items -- student activism in general, student politics, and campus radicals of the time.

Mixer: Yes. I want to deal with that, because I think it has a remarkable parallel to today's situation. In 1940 through '43, when I was on the Berkeley campus, there was a very tight restriction upon who could or could not be invited to speak on campus; and therefore all radical speakers, all political candidates of any party, had to speak at Sather Gate.

Nathan: That was then the edge of the campus, wasn't it?

Mixer: That's right. Telegraph Avenue ran up to Sather Gate, and the northeast and west corners of the intersection there were the corners on which the radicals would mount their platforms, or even get on some box or something like that, and would speak from there. They also passed out literature.

This function of free speech at Sather Gate is very vividly recalled by any number of preceding generations of alumni. I have heard them recall

Mixer: it even today. You know, some of them that are really realistic about students' concerns with liberal ideas -- they'll say, "Well, there always were these radicals at Sather Gate." I can remember representatives of the Young Communist League, the Socialist Party, Norman Thomas speaking there; any number of different groups would speak at Sather Gate.

Now there was always an active but very small group of extreme revolutionary radicals -- at least I would assume that this is what they were at the time -- members of the Young Communist League and of the Socialist Workers' Party and the Socialist Labor Party, who were involved in political activities. Of course in the period before the United States' entry into the war, from the fall of '40 when I started until Pearl Harbor, there was a tremendous group of young people who were concerned about the draft and felt it was unfair. There was a conscientious objectors' group.

There was a coalition attempted on every occasion, in terms of issues that would come up about the war, in which you would find repetitively names of some of the students who were officers of these radical student groups. There were a number of peace rallies, and there were petitions

Mixer: handed out.

About-Face of the Young Communist Groups

Mixer: The specific thing that I'm leading up to is the incident that occurred within a 48 hour period surrounding the invasion of Russia by Nazi Germany. The day before that occurred the Young Communist League and some of its fellow organizations were beating the drums for peace. And within 48 hours they completely reversed themselves and were advocating all-out war and the immediate intervention of the United States in the war and so on. Well, this about-face dictated by Soviet policy so completely disillusioned the people who had legitimate concerns for peace, and not political concerns, that it discredited the radical political movements to a degree that they really never recovered any strength or acceptance for the next year and a half that I was at Berkeley. I remember talking to some of the kids who had religious convictions and were Quakers and so on, and who were concerned about peace as a way of life. And to have people who they thought were working for their same objective suddenly espouse war -- they

Mixer: were pretty shaken.

Moral Concerns and Political Issues

Mixer: So it was kind of an interesting object lesson to show how there's an effort on the part of radical groups to subvert a given issue for their political ends. I think that we see a great deal of that struggle back and forth of people today in student groups -- those young people who have genuine moral and ethical concerns about war, and those who view it wholly as a major political issue. I know I've talked with some of the students I'm involved with when we've gotten into some informal discussions, and they find it kind of interesting and sort of thought-provoking to think about their current scene in the perspective of a little history of the University.

Nathan: In what way are you connected with these students? Are they working on the Centennial Fund with you?

Mixer: Yes, right. They're a group of about 25 students who form and make up a Centennial Advisory Committee, a student advisory committee for the Berkeley Centennial Fund. Joe Wharton is the chairman, and they have a number of subdivisions. John Welborn

Mixer: became chairman of the student campaign for the Berkeley Centennial Fund.

The Ban on Political Speech

Nathan: You were saying a few moments ago that at one time candidates for public office were not allowed to speak on campus. Was this a President's ruling? Do you know how this was put into effect?

Mixer: Yes. It was my impression that any speaker on campus had to be approved by the President's office.

Nathan: So a group who wanted to sponsor such a speech would have to make application through the President's office?

Mixer: And would be turned down if it were a political speech. There were certain rules promulgated at the time that there couldn't be candidates' speeches. This is quite a different situation today from what it was.

Nathan: It's interesting to hear you develop this. You're in a unique position, because you've lived through at least two major generations of political activism on campus.

Mixer: Sure.

Nathan: After that "no-candidates" rule, wasn't there then some sort of modification that if someone on one side spoke someone on the other side also had to? Did this develop while you were still on campus?

Mixer: Well, I can't recall that fact specifically. It may well have; I don't know. Do you have any inside information as to whether it did?

The Kerr Rules on Free Speech

Nathan: I know that there have been a series of developments leading up to the present situation, in which under proper circumstances individual candidates can speak on campus.

Mixer: Well, it's my impression that this was not changed substantially until 1960. You recall that under the Kerr Rules on Free Speech, which came out really prior to the FSM, I believe, that his statement of what could be heard on campus was implemented on the basis that if a political party or a person of a political persuasion spoke on campus, there had to be a faculty person to moderate the program, and there had to be an opportunity for questions, if there were not two opposing parties. I can't recall that, but there was a directive put out by

Mixer: President Kerr in the early '60's. And that, it seems to me, was one of the first kinds of swings of opening up the campus to all political viewpoints.

INTERPRETING THE CAMPUS TO THE COMMUNITY

Nathan: Right. Now, in your present position with the Centennial Fund, do you find that you have the job of attempting to interpret campus developments to members of the community?

Mixer: Oh, absolutely. All the time -- every day.

Nathan: What kinds of questions do you have to field?

Mixer: Well, the parallel, of course, is the case of Eldridge Cleaver, and the really concerned viewpoint of many alumni as to why the University would feel that a convicted felon and an admitted rapist is an important enough person and a substantive enough person to occupy as many as 10 lectures out of a total of 20 for a quarter period.

The more thoughtful of them are concerned:
"Is this the proper balance? Is there enough substance within the person himself, enough background, to speak effectively in a scholarly or near-scholarly fashion?"

The people who were more emotional about it just can't see the validity of a convicted felon talking to young people. Their fear, apparently,

Mixer: is that the minds of the students will become less objective and will be influenced by what these people have to say.

Nathan: That is to say these nonscholastic people?

Mixer: Yes, right. Or, in general, anyone with a radical viewpoint (differing from what the establishment currently believes) is thought to be dangerous. It is thought that students are young and impressionable and can't sift fact from fiction and that their minds will be molded and impressed with radical ideas which will then lead to the overthrow of what they (the establishment) feel to be the best. Now this is the kind of viewpoint that comes through from a number of our community leaders.

On the other hand, there are a great number of these people who, while they wouldn't invite this kind of a person to lecture to their particular group, would allow the University to have these speakers in the hope, and with the confidence really, that the students will get a balanced viewpoint.

The Use of Vignettes

Nathan: How do you handle these responses that you get?

Mixer: Well, the most effective way is by small vignettes. You develop a kind of a bag of vignettes that you carry around with you mentally and haul out on occasion for putting across a point.

One that I like to use on this question of the impressionable young minds is an actual example that I heard when Malcolm X was here on the campus and spoke in Dwinelle Plaza. There were about a thousand students there, and I mingled with them after the speech to try to pick up what kind of sensitivities were apparent on the part of the students to Malcolm X's viewpoints and his approach. I overheard two rather young Freshmen -- obviously they were either Freshmen or Sophomores because of their youthful nature, two young men -- coming away, and one of them turned to his friend and said, "Gee, that fellow Malcolm X sure is a very persuasive speaker."

The second young man responded by saying, "Yes, but he's got his ideas all mixed up."

And the first one retorted, "Yes, you're right."

Well, using a vignette like this demonstrates in a very concrete way that the lack of trust that our older generation may have in the intellectual process of the younger ones is misplaced -- that these kids do think about these things and do

Mixer: evaluate and sift them out. I think this is the only way you can do it.

Another thing, of course, arose just this morning with regard to the Cleaver thing. One of our more conservative committee chairmen was out of town the last ten days, wanted to get caught up, and was curious as to the status of the Cleaver course. I told him the outcome of the last two lectures, and he accepted it. He didn't make any strong protest like, "Well, we've got to get Cleaver off the campus." He said, "Well, this thing is working out as the Chancellor had hoped it would."

Another thing too is that wherever we can, I use another sort of vignette. I quote from Saul Alinsky's article in Harper's of the summer of '65, in which he very clearly set forth how a group bent on social change operates -- that they'll go into a community or area and create an incident. Then they will attempt to escalate the incident to become out of the bounds of the circumstance of the incident into a civil rights or a social cause of broad humanitarian or civil rights implications. Then they will depend upon the overreaction of the moderates to take repressive or unintelligent or emotional reactions or responses.

Mixer: Then they'll escalate the battle further, the controversy further, and in the process they obtain several hundreds of thousands of dollars of free publicity, when they couldn't even buy one inch if they had to go out and pay for it.

So they admittedly work the press and the public media, and they work the moderate group, relying upon them to be stimulated and jabbed by the extreme conservative group. And so on through the escalation. And so we suggest to our people, "Don't fall into that trap. Don't be suckered in by overreacting. Don't do what the radicals want you to do. Don't be predictable." This has an effect of calming them down.

Nathan: So you're suggesting a little sophistication in the whole process?

Mixer: Sure. Oh, of course. And an understanding of the concerns of civil rights, and what the nature of a university is, too. You see, a lot of them don't really understand the nature of a university, that it is concerned with testing ideas, that it is a marketplace for ideas.

Another vignette is to cite the story of what Harvey White says. Well, he said this about six or seven years ago.

Nathan: Is this the physicist, Dr. Harvey White?

Mixer: Yes, Dr. Harvey White, director of the Lawrence Hall of Science. He said about six years ago that he was at that point teaching his high Freshmen, low Sophomores the same material that 10 years before he taught the high Juniors and low Seniors in physics. And that just in 10 years time.

So these kids are coming better prepared to us with more background understanding, with a more highly developed sense of evaluation of intellectual concepts. We have to have a little more trust as adults to let them be exposed to ideas.

Then the final capstone is, you know, "If you're so concerned with fighting Communism or people who seek to overthrow the country, why are you going to tie the hands of these kids and not let them know what it is that they're supposed to be fighting?" So these kinds of arguments, well, you just have to bring them in at appropriate times to create some kind of an understanding.

The Nature of a University

Nathan: How did you develop your concept of what a university is and how it should function? How did this develop in your mind?

Mixer: Well, I'm working on a Ph.D. degree in higher education.

Nathan: You are now, in your spare time?

Mixer: Yes. Well, not these two years [with the Centennial Fund], but up until two years ago I was working on it. I've just postponed it for a two year period, then I'll go back to it.

You see, this was one of the concerns that I had when Roger Heyns came here. I urged him to make every effort and use every occasion to talk about what the nature of a university was, because people didn't understand today. They didn't understand the complexity, and they didn't understand why professors should do research or why they should be off being consultants, and why a person who creates knowledge is in a much better position to transmit it with excitement and a fervor and illumination and to do a better job of teaching students than someone who has to read about discoveries in books and then try to develop some enthusiasm over it and reinterpret it to students.

Faculty Attitudes

Nathan: You were suggesting that students now come to the university at a much higher level of information and sophistication now than they did, let's say, ten years ago.

Mixer: I think so, sure.

Nathan: Do you feel that this is true of the faculty group? Has that changed in your estimation as far as sophistication and ability to handle issues goes?

Mixer: The faculty as a total group on the campus? You mean to respond to a crisis situation on an issue?

Nathan: That's what I'm trying to get at, yes.

Mixer: I think they are probably considerably more sophisticated, but I think many of them do respond in traditional patterns. You see, a faculty person is extremely conservative about his own business and process, when he may be a radical about everybody else's.

This is another vignette that I use with our concerned outside people. I say, "Have a little confidence. There's no more conservative group than the faculty." They look at me with a funny expression like I've got holes in my head. Then I pause and go on to say, "When you're talking about

Mixer: their rights in employment, their rights to teach what they think is important, and their security of employment, they are one of the most conservative professional groups in the world about these conditions. Anything that seeks to move or to jeopardize this they will respond to with a great deal of vehemence." And they do.

Nathan: This push for more student influence, say, in curriculum and in faculty tenure - you don't see the faculty as being too receptive to this effort?

Mixer: I think that the FSM had a considerable impact on the faculty here, that they began to feel some sense of guilt that they had been ignoring this problem. I don't know how many would admit to this, but it's just my own strong feeling that this is the case, that this prepared the way for the climate in which the Muscatine Report could be even authorized, let alone prepared and in part accepted.

The strategy of Charles Muscatine in implementing his report was to get Section 19, the creation of the Board of Educational Development, instituted as the first specific action of educational innovation.¹ All the other derivative

¹California, University, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division, Select Committee on Education 1965-66, Education at Berkeley. Report of the Select Committee on Education. [Muscatine Report] (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968).

Mixer: issues, which would strike more immediately at the security of professors and their own decisions as to how they would teach or organize for teaching or the content of their courses, was left until later, so that this one thing would be adopted. It was a very shrewd tactic.

This whole question of how a modern university continues to create new knowledge, examine traditional concepts, throw out those found to be in error and substitute new ones based on fact, is a real problem in terms of getting an acceptance in the community. It's hooked up with the high cost of education, which is reflected in taxes, and it's hooked up with the increasing polarization of political and economic viewpoints between the right and the left, a trend that started in the '60's, according to Clark Kerr, the early '60's, and the lack of understanding of what a university is all about.

The Darwinian Age in the Social Sciences

Nathan: You're suggesting that perhaps the general public has not advanced proportionately to the advance in

Nathan: the knowledge of the student body, of the viewpoints of the students?

Mixer: Well, in terms of what a university should be, that's right. They're not at all aware of the major contributions that a university makes to its society or appreciate it fully. You know, like the fact that you can open a can of food and eat it with safety was only possible through the work of the University of California and its study of the disease of botulism back in 1921. That gave birth really to the canning industry. So when you think of the kinds of things we've done in the agricultural area and the nuclear science area and in many, many areas, the University's been a tremendous resource.

Now it's coming to be a political object, because it has advanced in the scientific areas -- the hard sciences. What they call the soft sciences being the social sciences, we're back in the Age of Darwin in the social sciences, where the new facts of the social science world are not being accepted without extreme concern and controversy in the community, just as the whole question of the scientific revolution was discussed beginning with Darwin. It became a controversy in the communities.

Mixer: So, I think it's kind of a fascinating, exciting world we're living in in terms of how we work these things out.

Nathan: Do you have any thoughts about how best to build some sort of understanding between the University and the community at large?

Mixer: Yes. I feel very definitely that the University is suffering today from some of the benefits that it has enjoyed for many years. Namely, we had a very strong, popular, eloquent spokesman as a president -- Robert Gordon Sproul -- who was particularly persuasive with the Legislature. We had some understanding governors, and certainly we had legislators who supported the University to a great extent at times when it was quite difficult, particularly during the Depression. So there was a momentum of support that has carried forward, and the University as such did not have to rely on the body politic as much, did not have to cultivate that body politic as it might have had to if there had been a more difficult time in maintaining its support from the Legislature. Now we're reaping the harvest of those years of ignoring the body politic.

Nathan: You feel we really did ignore the body politic?

Mixer: Well, yes. I'd have to qualify. We certainly

Mixer: didn't make as all-out an effort as we might have done.

The Body Politic in a Changing State

Mixer: The population characteristics of the state have changed immensely. The new population requires even additional effort beyond what we have done at any time in the history of the University, because heretofore the proportion of alumni who were in legislative positions, in business and industry, was quite a bit greater than it is today. So that means that the people who have political and economic influence in the state today are less aware of the University by not having participated in it, than was the case in past generations.

Therefore it's incumbent upon us to relate what this University is and what it contributes to the state to a higher degree. A part of this will come about naturally, because you get these swings of power and balances. As the funds get tighter in relation to our needs, the faculty will become more concerned about getting the money, because they will not have it to spend and they'll be hurting for it.

So they'll do one of two things: they'll

Mixer: either make an increasing effort to get foundation support or corporation support or support through fund-raising programs such as we're involved in, or legislative support. Now the latter three involve some kind of communication with the public and the people who are influential in molding public opinion. And so we'll see a real interest on the part of deans of schools and colleges here to make their advisory councils, which are composed of community citizens and business and governmental leaders, very effective and important as a two-way communication device.

Reaching Out

Nathan: Do you feel these advisory councils have not been developed adequately up to this time?

Mixer: No, I think they've been there; they've been used to some extent effectively on occasion. Then they'd have ups and downs, but not a very concerted total campus effort applied to them, because it wasn't important. Now it is, and so we'll see a reactivation of these. We have hundreds, literally hundreds, of alumni whom we haven't paid any attention to until just in the last two or three

Mixer: years, people who are quite influential in our society and who can do things for the University.

Nathan: You're really suggesting closer links with a leadership group. Are you thinking also of closer links with, say, the communities that now are in great turmoil -- the Black community, the Mexican-Americans, and so on, who are not necessarily people who can do much for the University financially? Do you feel the University needs to do anything there?

Mixer: Oh, absolutely. I think [President Charles] Hitch's program of concertedly directing funds, research time, teaching time, new program development to the urban crisis is first-rate in making the University a more useful institution relevant to the society from which it gains its support, much more than it might have been.

This is saying quite a bit, because my own personal belief is that it's extremely useful -- but it will be more apparent that it's useful. Just the same way, when agriculture accounted for 80 percent, then 60 percent, now still 50 percent of our state's total economy, our agricultural extension was a very vital arm in terms of assuring the progress of the state and in turn assuring the support of the University. Now the same application

Mixer: of resources to the urban situation I think will be mutually productive both in terms hopefully of solving some of these crises in a very specific way and dealing with them concretely, and also in terms of providing an understanding that the University can indeed be beneficial in a quite direct way.

Nathan: In some ways it might be harder to show this than it is to point to an atom-smasher or a can of string beans -- you know, the things that the University has produced or made possible.

Mixer: Oh, sure, but if you can say, "Look.. Here's an area. Five years ago the predictable chances of it being levelled by riot were 90 percent, and now most everyone will agree that it will not erupt into a period of violence." That can be translated into millions of dollars of insured property values -- merchandise, markets, transportation facilities, communication facilities that aren't disrupted or torn or blown apart and so on.

It's a very specific dollar and cents kind of thing, so that I think it's demonstrable. Plus the fact that the tensions and the insecurities that people feel, as evidenced by their reaction to Cleaver, will be lessened.

And you know, while we're on that, the dire predictions that were made and the tension that

Mixer: people felt about the outcome of the Huey Newton trial -- and what happened? The only thing that happened is that a couple of Oakland police shot up the Black Panther headquarters, if you think about it. What happened to the Eldridge Cleaver lectures? There were dire predictions about how he's corrupting the minds of these young people. As you start to assemble the results, he gave a very sober, very thoughtful, and almost scholarly presentation. The smokescreen produced by those who objected to it provided an opportunity for Cleaver to get speaking engagements all over the United States, which he wouldn't have gotten otherwise. It probably resulted in hundreds or thousands of copies of his books being sold, with a personal revenue to Cleaver. What has been the reaction, or what have been the results? Well, it's obvious now that it's been an overreaction of the moderates and an overreaction of the extremists.

So I think that these fears we have built in about the emergence of the minority groups to more important positions of responsibility and economic influence and so on are greatly overexaggerated. The only people who really get hurt in the violence appear to be the Negro people, the minority groups.

Mixer: You take the number of people shot and killed and wounded in this country or in any riot -- it's always predominately at least two-to-one if not ten-to-one Blacks who are the victims. I think the Kerner Report brought that out. Well, as an institution, we must be able to relate to these problems and have minority groups say, "This is an institution which has concern; this is an institution which is doing something about it, and therefore: one, we'll either leave it alone, or two, we can relax about it, or we can relate to it."

As California exists, most of our educational institutions are in relatively populous areas. They've been located there to provide easy access to the educational facilities by resident people. So they're at the centers and what will increasingly become centers. Even those who are in suburban areas are becoming parts of the urban complex, will have the central city problems, and they'd better jolly well be able to relate to them.

THE UNIVERSITY'S CENTENNIAL FUND

Nathan: This is really, I think, very useful indeed. We were suggesting that the relatively easy financial times for the University had come to an end essentially because of various factors you have mentioned, and I gather that you think perhaps the Centennial Fund itself is an expression of this change. Is that a fair statement?

Mixer: Yes, I would say it is. It wasn't specifically born because of a sense of decreasing legislative support, but it was born out of the fact that in the last 15 years or so the things that the Legislature could support have been cut back drastically. They used to support the building of auditoria, gymnasia, recreational facilities, housing -- they don't any more. These things must now be financed privately or from student fees.

The Factors of Growth and Rising Costs

Nathan: Now was this a policy decision within the Legislature

Nathan: itself?

Mixer: Oh, sure. It wasn't to my knowledge a purposely constructed diminution of support for the University or now the state colleges. It was just that each year, with a burgeoning college population, the legislators and the State Department of Finance and the governor, along with the trustees of the state colleges and the Regents, said, "What can we reasonably get in the way of tax support for our educational institutions, and what are we going to have to give up to meet the rapid expansion of the demand for educational institutions?"

Now coupled with this, of course, you might say, "Well, gee, with this increased population why couldn't the same ratio be maintained and therefore people shoulder the same relative burden and support the University as they have in the past?"

The cost of education has gone up. The cost of instruction, the use of equipment is much higher than it was in the past. You didn't have expensive, million dollar computers on campuses before this as teaching tools or research tools. When you consider that, and I think it's a fairly proven fact, that 85 percent of all the scientists who ever existed in the world are alive today, you

Mixer: have to envisage an immensely expanding body of fact and knowledge that's being developed and that the knowledge explosion is real. How do you handle this vast amount of information?

Nathan: I suppose you have to have the memory banks and all the rest of it.

Mixer: Sure. Somehow we've got to radically change the library, which is our repository of information, of learned information, to make its holdings much more accessible through mechanical or electronic means, rather than by walking to the stacks and pulling a book out and walking it back and checking it out. It's just like an automobile maker going to a body of iron ore and starting from scratch to make an automobile. We've got to learn to mass-transmit this information without sacrificing quality, of course.

The Need of Funds for Student Housing

Nathan: Right now as you were speaking of the narrowing of the sorts of things that the Legislature now actually supports, you did mention housing. Is this student housing?

Mixer: Yes.

Nathan: You included that?

Mixer: Sure. Oh, absolutely.

Nathan: So the University itself has to fund housing developments?

Mixer: That's right. You see, that are no more new dormitories contemplated for this campus which we hope to fund from state sources. Now we're trying very much to get some sort of a graduate student housing.

Nathan: Apartment type housing?

Mixer: Yes, right. Probably with separate living and toilet facilities but perhaps with small communal kitchens, or even small apartments -- efficiency apartments with a sense of individual proprietors and not with supervision by the institution. But how that's to be done in a way that would be appealing to students is going to be very difficult to work out.

Nathan: But you think the big legislative support for residence halls is over?

Mixer: Absolutely. And I think we may see an increase with some imaginative partnerships with private entrepreneurs, using University land, and with buildings built by private entrepreneurs and operated by them, so the capital is not from the University. But it is amortized or paid off through the payments

Mixer: of the students, the beneficiaries of the education.

The Idea Behind the Centennial Fund

Mixer: Let me take a few minutes on the Berkeley Centennial Fund, which is paying for my time here. The Centennial Fund grew out of the concept that the Centennial year of the University was an occasion which should be marked by a suitable and significant observance, by some achievement and recognition of that achievement and more specifically that it would provide an opportunity to point up the needs of the University, raise substantial funds to meet these needs and better prepare it as it entered its second century of existence. This latter was, of course, based on the recognition (that we discussed earlier) of the limitations that had been placed upon state support.

I think the first proposal was a memorandum that I wrote to Professor Raymond Sontag in 1961 or '62, because he was serving as chairman of the Chancellor's Committee to Prepare for the Centennial Observance, or some such title. I pointed out in my capacity as Campus Gift Officer, the opportunity to raise perhaps significant sums for the benefit

Mixer: of the campus on the occasion of the Centennial, and the quite obvious reference to other institutions that had done likewise, but primarily private institutions.

Dream Projects and Student Needs

Mixer: So then, this committee mulled this over and didn't really do too much about this until, in the fall of 1963, President Kerr was quite anxious to complete two of his dream projects: they were a suitable auditorium theater, and a suitable art museum for this campus. They were part of the original planning recommendations of the Survey of Student Needs developed in 1948 by the Alumni Association and further documented in 1956 under Clark Kerr's aegis. They called for an adequate auditorium theater and for some place in which the University art collections could be appropriately housed. So Kerr insisted that somehow money be raised for these and that the Centennial was a good time perhaps to do it, and they were passed in principle in the Regents' meeting in December of 1963, and in January of 1964 the planning started in earnest.

Mixer: O. Cort Majors, former Alumni president and All-American great of the Class of '21, was hired as a part-time assistant to the Berkeley Chancellor, Ed Strong, to work with myself and Chancellor Strong in developing the sources of funding. We spent two and a half years in developing the plan. Of course, we were right in the midst of launching our program when the FSM broke loose in the fall of '64. We had, I think, at that time a proposal for about a \$10 million program.

From \$45 Million to \$15 Million

Mixer: By further research, as we developed the needs of the campus, we considered by the spring of '65 that there were \$45 million in total needs that should be met from private sources. This was whittled down to the present \$15 million program by two specific actions.

One was Chancellor Heyns' decision that any concerted effort of the campus at that point in time, upon his arrival at the campus in September of '65, must be devoted to the urgent needs of students and those things that caused the concern of students, that made them erupt in such a vehement

Mixer: way through the FSM period.

A whole 50 percent of the needs were just immediately cut out. Those related to research, to faculty-related activities. We left in the student-oriented projects. We arranged them in four significant areas. One was to make it a campus more personal for students. That included student-faculty commons rooms, recreational facilities, the Northside Student Center.

Then another area was student educational opportunities, which really meant financial aid -- scholarships, fellowships -- but also important innovative kinds of student assistance funds, namely funds for students to go out on field trips, to travel to other areas, to see material originally, to purchase time on computers, to purchase time on electron microscopes, and so on. This was part of our present package that we're trying to fund.

Another was innovation in teaching and learning, and the last was cultural enrichment, which included the auditorium theatre and the art museum, money for displays, a million dollars for the library, and so on, and indeed, maybe part of this history project.

The Student Advisory Committee

Mixer: Second, we also instituted a Student Advisory Committee in the fall of '65, because we had not had any student input to the program. This was most helpful, and indeed, the students had a major role in shaping the final character of the projects that were included within the \$15 million capital program. It was quite interesting to watch the process whereby very radical students and very conservative students agreed that both recreation -- football, intramural fields -- student-faculty commons rooms, and library facilities were equally important, and that while one couldn't support the other fully, they agreed that the total campus needed all of these aspects, and so they voted for it entirely.

The letter of endorsement to the Regents, containing the signature of all of these students, was written by Mike Tigar, one of the more radical and revolutionary kinds of people on this campus. He wrote a beautiful endorsing letter to the Regents, which surprised everyone because he had written it, and it was signed by all the students. It was a very eloquent statement of their belief in and support of these projects as fundamental

Mixer: to improving the quality of the educational experience at Berkeley.

Nathan: How many students were involved?

Mixer: About 25.

Nathan: And how did you pick them, find them?

Mixer: The Chancellor asked the President of the Student Body, I think it was Jerry Goldstein, if he would nominate a panel of 25 students. It seems to me that of his 25 students all but one or two were finally appointed to the Committee.

Nathan: So it was really a student selected group?

Mixer: That's right. Very much so, and is today. It's tied in as an ASUC student activity. There was a five-fold purpose for a student program, for their responsibility. One was to determine the initial projects that would be in the fund. Two, to establish some sort of priority of need that would direct the fund-raising groups, the volunteers, as to what they thought ought to be funded first. Third was to evaluate the allocation and recommend on the expenditure of unrestricted funds, should there be any, but unfortunately we have had very few unrestricted funds available, so that it hasn't been operative. The fourth thing was to maintain a stockpile of unmet student needs that would be dealt with after the completion of the Centennial

Mixer: Fund. And the fifth one was to provide an interpretation of the Centennial Fund to the student body, to faculty, and to our alumni. This is their function, and they are functioning effectively in these areas.

Enlisting and Educating the Alumni

Mixer: Well we set about in those early days to enlist the cooperation of our alumni, many of whom we hadn't asked to do anything for many years. Or, at least, the only interest that they had was football and athletics. It became readily apparent that it was a job of educating them as to what a University really was and why it needed funds and why tax monies wouldn't support fully the cost of the University. Moving on until today, we have over 300 alumni of all persuasions and walks of life, but primarily from the power influentials in the state and nation, leading this campaign.

Nathan: Is the campaign centered at Berkeley?

Mixer: Yes, and only for the Berkeley campus.

Nathan: Are there other people working on the other campuses?

Mixer: No. UCLA is coming the closest to it in their plans to develop a fiftieth anniversary fund --

Mixer: their fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the campus is 1969. The other campuses had plans to do so, but they really didn't marshal enough effort to get it off the ground.

The Concerns of the Private Institutions

Nathan: It takes great effort, doesn't it?

Mixer: Sure, it really does. I left out one point in terms of why we pared down our total to \$15 million. The other significant factor was -- and this I think will be very important in the history of the University as we go along -- the concern that the private institutions had with the University of California raising funds from the private sector for its support. They made a very eloquent plea to President Kerr and members of the Board of Regents by stating that they know as a proven fact that given one dollar they can raise ten. That being the case, knowing that capability, they would assume that the University, "with unlimited resources" from the State Legislature, could preempt the whole field of private giving for the University's purposes and therefore put them out of business. In a combination of

Mixer: this concern, President Kerr, way back in the 1960's, struck up an agreement among the private universities that the University's fund-raising program would be confined to a given constituency, and that constituency would be our alumni; friends of the campus who had been involved by virtue of contact or donation; foundations -- no restriction on foundations; and, to a limited extent, the corporations, but only those corporations in which we had a great number of top executives who were alumni and/or had considerable relationship with the University in the form of recruiting people or doing research with us. So this was the famous 1960 agreement.

Then, in the winter of 1965, Kerr made an agreement again because the private colleges became aware that we were planning this Centennial Fund and they didn't know the nature or scope of it. They had a session with President Kerr and Regent Edward W. Carter, who was then Chairman of the Board of Regents, and it was agreed by Kerr and Carter that the University, during its Centennial Fund celebration, would raise no more than \$30 million, of which the Berkeley campus would raise only \$15 million. And that's really how our goal was set.

Nathan: That's interesting. One wouldn't normally think of the private institutions as involved in that way.

Mixer: Political considerations, and the private institutions' concern over their well-being. That's a little background story which I don't think will come to light very often, but it really had a very significant impact. From time to time, as we inevitably move into areas that might be close to the boundaries of whom we are supposed to be able to solicit, there will be reactions from the private institutions, and we'll get their trustees calling our trustees, or their trustees talking to our President or Chancellor, saying, "Are you really adhering to this agreement? Are you living up to it?" And so on.

Well, one of the major reasons for the University striking up this agreement in the first place is the integral part that they played in creating the Master Plan for Higher Education for California. The University of California needed their support to get it into effect and to make it work, and still does.

Nathan: Did you have any similar problem with the state college system?

Mixer: No, not really. No.

Nathan: They don't see this activity as a threat to them?

Mixer: No. As a matter of fact, they are undertaking very rudimentary fund-raising programs. They are much more of a threat to the private colleges than they are to us in terms of increasing the amount. But I still feel quite strongly that the private colleges' concern is an overreaction. They have a theory that there's a fixed limit on the charitable dollar in which, you know, if each person is ladling out of the same bucket, the amount [available to each] goes down. Whereas my theory -- and I think it's demonstrable -- is that there is no limit to the charitable dollar.

It's an elastic supply; depending upon the demand made upon it and the effectiveness of that demand. There will be a limitation of money to those institutions which are of poor caliber or who do not have a significant function or purpose to perform. They'll have a tough time; there's no question about that, and I certainly regret that this is true. But in the sense, as the Durants [Ariel and Will] say, one of the lessons of history is that it's a life of competition, that maybe being in this situation they will improve and become more effective institutions. But that's certainly not our purpose to get into fund-raising to do that for them -- not at all.

We feel that we're approaching our own

Mixer: specific clientele and we are tapping resources that would not otherwise be available. I can prove it time and time again -- specific large-scale grants that would not be available to any institution except Berkeley because of the call we can make upon that particular alumnus, or the kinds of programs that we will undertake that are not possible for some of the other institutions.

Sources of Support

Nathan: Can you generalize at all about what groups or individuals have been most responsive to your appeals, and which have been least?

Mixer: Well, it's hard.

Nathan: If it's not a fair question, you don't have to answer.

Mixer: Oh, sure, it's a very fair question; it's an important question. I think that we have made a diligent effort to secure support from our alumni and from our friends, and they have responded. Those people who have had some connection with the University in some way through activity or constant contact respond, of course, much more readily than those who had never heard from the University since the day they graduated. So the

Mixer: men who have been involved in the athletic program, as being concerned with athletics, have formed a very important nucleus for our fund-raising efforts.

People who have had some contact with the University because their companies and firms have used the products of its research and knowledge or have recruited here have been very amenable to participation and to giving corporate support. We've gotten good response from corporations primarily because we developed a very distinctive program for them to support. Of course we've had excellent results from foundations.

Nathan: Well, conversely, have the campus agitations -- for example, with respect to the recruiting by Dow Chemical -- has this sort of thing been a problem in your enterprises?

Mixer: Well, we've gone through numerous crises since 1964. I tried to sit down and list all of them, and they just faded into the distance, because there were so many crises that have come up and have seemed to have given our good alumni reasons for abandoning us, but somehow or other we can convince them that they must be steadfast. Every time that there is a public furor and we're on page one, we get a strong reaction, but the rewarding experience that we're now having is that

Mixer: our alumni leaders who are very powerful economic and political people respond to each new crisis with the question, "What is the University's position so I can interpret it more effectively?" Rather than saying, "What's going on up there? I'm quitting tomorrow." We've been able to educate them, coming back to my earlier comments, as to the nature of a University and the importance of these kinds of examinations of ideas, and we give them an understanding of the problems of working with young people in today's environment. Our job has been immensely easier when Stanford has suffered problems, and particularly when Columbia did too. We had some contacts with our alumni and with other influential people on the eastern seaboard. They kind of dismissed Berkeley as a receptacle for a number of bright, intelligent dissidents; and said this could never happen to a well-run eastern Ivy League college. Well, the Columbia episode has boosted our stock immeasurably. I hate to profit by somebody else's misfortune, but indeed we have done so.

Nathan: Do you feel that this educational process that the Centennial Fund has put in motion will somehow be continued?

Mixer: Oh, yes. There's always a hiatus after an intensive effort. Everybody's tired and wants to get back

Mixer: to other tasks and jobs, and there's usually a letdown. Well, if we're astute, knowing that this has traditionally happened, we'll avoid it and continue this, because I think as an institution we need both the direct and the indirect benefits of involving our alumni in active support of the campus.

Nathan: Now, when the Centennial Fund is over, then will the Gifts and Endowments Office still continue on the campus?

Mixer: Oh, of course.

Nathan: So this is a regular, on-going enterprise?

Mixer: That's right. This was established by Clark Kerr in 1959, and I was the first employee, full-time, in this area for the University statewide. All of the functions were centralized and the policies developed, and then the office was in a position to decentralize the operation to the several campuses so that little or no fund-raising is done by the statewide central group. Ninety-five percent of all the fund-raising is done by the separate campuses.

Nathan: It's interesting that you were in at the very beginning and that your suggestion was important in the Centennial Fund idea. You've been right in there all the way.

Mixer: Well, it's kind of fun to have a part in seeing these opportunities and then working hard to make them come to fruition. But this institution is not the product of any person, or no aspect of it is; it's a product of group effort, because everybody gets together and is concerned about the quality of education here and about our ability to deliver so that our program can be effective.

THE CAMPUS ROLE OF STUDENT RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Nathan: You were saying perhaps you would like to talk a bit about the problems of discrimination and . . .

Mixer: Race relations. I think when the full history of this University is eventually written, an important chapter is going to have to be given to the part that the student religious groups played on this campus, and in particular the student YMCA and YWCA. I'm thinking of such wonderful, thoughtful people as Harry Kingman and Leila Anderson.

Nathan: Oh yes. Remember Lily Margaret Sherman?

Mixer: And Lily Margaret Sherman, oh yes. These people, because of their perspective and maturity and very deep concerns over right human relations, influenced a tremendous number of students, particularly in my era. They were personally effective with the students; they were committed to a cause; they did everything they could to create an understanding of the problem and to make students aware of it. I really wasn't aware of the race problem as a student coming out of high school and didn't even know that there was such a thing until I began to

Mixer: be exposed to it at Stiles Hall. And the concerns that Harry Kingman and Bill Davis had about this. I'm sure that, like so many things that they've done, the Student Employment Office, the Housing Office, all grew out of volunteer service activities of the Y's. And then they were taken over by the University. You see, the free speech forums of the University at that time really were the YMCA and the YWCA.

The Gus Hall Controversy

Mixer: I can remember the battle that Stiles Hall had in 1956 or thereabouts -- it was before I came back to the University -- over Gus Hall [a leading American Communist] speaking at Stiles Hall. There was tremendous pressure brought to bear through the United Bay Area Crusade to cancel the support of Stiles Hall. The faculty who were members of the advisory board came forth and stood staunchly by it in some very crisis-filled situations, and now that whole function of free speech has transferred to the campus.

Nathan: Now this presentation of Gus Hall -- was this on campus or in a Y building?

Mixer: In a Y building. Oh yes -- off-campus, if you can imagine. And that was only 12 years ago, if you can imagine that. When you think of the open forum campus we have today, you can see the kind of shock that the people in the community must have about the University being such an open forum.

Community Activities and Race Relations

Nathan: And you see the Y's as the innovators?

Mixer: Yes, very definitely, in many, many areas. They were the innovators in all of the programs for student participation in the community. When I was a student we had a Big Brother project where we went down and worked with delinquent kids and served as adult or semi- or partially adult models for these young delinquent kids, counselled them, befriended them, talked with them, helped them. So this is one of the aspects.

The major thrust of the Stiles program was, I think, its impact in the area of race relations. My first contact really with Orientals and Negroes was through Stiles Hall as a Freshman. Then when I lived in the co-ops, which had always been open without regard to race, color, or creed, was the

Mixer: first time I had ever lived in close contact with Orientals or Negroes. As I realize now, seeing where these people are, it wasn't a very different kind of a situation. They're all middle-class, successful professional people, and indeed, some of them are wealthy, one of whom -- Norm Huston, a Negro -- is on our southern California fund-raising committee, and he's a quite wealthy entrepreneur in Los Angeles.

Stiles was instrumental in helping the co-ops to start, and through many thick and thin periods in its early existence the steadfast support, advice, counsel, and time provided by the staff members of Stiles Hall, particularly Bill Davis, enabled the co-ops to survive and grow.

Of course, there was always the aspect of equal race relations, I mean good race relations, that was a part of it. For example, when I went into the co-op, my roommates at Oxford Hall were two Japanese-Americans, one German-Jewish refugee, and a second-generation Italian, and myself being a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant. All of them were A students except me. In fact, Harvey Itano was the University Medalist in 1942, and he was awarded this in absentia because he had been evacuated from the West Coast and was in a

Mixer: relocation camp at the time that he would have normally received the University Medalist Award. He was a straight A student at Berkeley and now is rendering very significant service in the National Institute of Mental Health as a medical director doing fundamental research in biochemistry.

Nathan: So you got into the co-ops with these various people.

Mixer: I had this experience at interracial living that I think was very fortunate and showed me that, you know, it was just like living with anybody else. There were no problems that couldn't be worked out.

Nathan: Were the Y's interested at the time in living conditions of agricultural workers? Was this one of the issues, do you recall?

Mixer: Yes, they were. At the time it seemed to me that migrant workers and their problems were of great concern to the people in Stiles Hall. There were several issues up before the Legislature in which I remember we took action as a student cabinet and even sent petitions and wires and called on our legislators. But that rapidly diminished in importance as an issue because of the war, and the opening of war jobs and people moving into them, and then obviously the growers had to increase their wages to attract and hold the

Mixer: people, and so on. Because they wouldn't increase their wages, they had all of these organized efforts to go out and harvest the crops, under the guise that everybody was in the Army. Really, under that guise, it was that the growers wouldn't pay the money to attract the workers. Many students picked apples and harvested crops and went out to the carrot fields and so on during the war time. I can remember teams of them going out by buses to do this sort of thing -- Victory Harvest Programs, they were called.

But I started in on race relations. One impression that I had of Oriental groups on campus was the colonies, and I speak of these colonies, that would occupy certain sections of the library. This was because we had no student center of any size or capacity. This was indeed their living room, their home away from home, and many of them were commuter students. They -- whole bodies of them -- would occupy given sections, corners, of the library study rooms at night. They were quite busy and very social and so on, and of course they were always excellent students.

The Gift of the Japanese Women's Student Club

Mixer: It's quite interesting to note that the Japanese Women's Student Club, which was on Hearst Avenue, was bought and paid for by groups on very minimal kinds of incomes as students. When it no longer became necessary as a specific living group because of the availability of University housing, they closed the club down and gave the property to the University. The University sold it for about \$80,000. It's now a scholarship fund for women students on the Berkeley campus.

Nathan: What an elegant thing to do..

Mixer: Yes. And I met in their house with a number of the alumnae who were the members of the corporation owning the Japanese Women's Student Club. Their great devotion to the University, their great loyalty to it and to the educational process were really heart-rending to see, and so was their concern to help educate the succeeding generations or assist them and their decision that a scholarship was the important way in which they could use the \$80,000 proceeds which would result from the University sale of the property.

Some Restrictions on Scholarships

Mixer: Many of the leaders are in Berkeley, so you could get this and talk with them about this whole history of race relations and housing and why they started it and the Japanese Men's House, which was on Euclid between Ridge Road and Le Conte. The Women's Club was on Hearst, two doors east of Euclid.

I think one of the ironic things about this question of non-discrimination is the interpretation by our general counsel that while you cannot discriminate against a minority, you also cannot discriminate against the majority. Let me explain. In other words, the University is not allowed, by interpretation of the general counsel, to accept a scholarship restricted to helping and assisting a racial, religious, or national origin minority. In other words, I had to tell these Japanese women that they could not restrict their scholarship fund to Japanese women students. This was quite a shock to them.

We cannot accept a scholarship fund that is limited to Negro students. We can accept a scholarship fund that is for culturally disadvantaged people or people who come from Asia, but

Mixer: we can't accept a scholarship for a person who comes from Japan, because that refers to national origin.

Nathan: Are there still funds for people who come from, say, Modoc County?

Mixer: Oh yes, sure there are.

Nathan: If you were to designate the area of origin sufficiently, maybe you could get by with that type of scholarship.

Mixer: Well, apparently state and geographical origin within the jurisdiction of the United States is okay for designation.

Nathan: You might try Watts, or something like that?

Mixer: That's right. I'm sure we could now.

Nathan: Not that I want you to try to circumvent the rulings of the counsel.

Mixer: My personal reaction is that the civil rights laws were not constructed to prohibit giving some benefit to minority groups, and that indeed the social purpose of the Civil Rights Act is to enable the minority groups to have stature equal, as far as benefits and rights and opportunities, to that of the majority. Therefore, it is perfectly legal for us to accept these scholarships restricted to favor a given minority. But I'm not a lawyer, and I'm not in a position to make

Mixer: that decision. There are ways in which we can hope to accomplish the same purpose by using broad generic terms, such as culturally disadvantaged, people from given continents or wide geographical areas which circumscribe specific national boundaries or which circumscribe a number of national boundaries, such as Asia as a place.

Nathan: Yes, I see. You were talking a little bit about the extraordinary function that the Y's performed. Were other religious groups involved at all?

Mixer: Yes, definitely. Hillel Foundation was very important, and the Plymouth clubs, and the Congregational groups, and the Methodist student groups, Presbyterian clubs -- all of these. There was an Inter-faith Council at the time. I wasn't really close enough to know how effective that Inter-faith Council was, but I know that there was a working relationship between the Y and the Protestant groups and that we often worked very closely with the Hillel Foundation and with the Newman Club on specific social issues, racial questions, one thing and another.

New Programs and Curricula

Nathan: Do you think that these groups are still performing the innovative services that they did in the past?

Mixer: I can't speak of Hillel and the other groups that are tied to specific sects, but I can speak for Stiles Hall; and I think it definitely is. Their new kinds of directional programs consist of these personal encounter groups, where students attempt to relate to and understand a group of other students in a very effective and open way.

Nathan: These groups are set up so that different races participate?

Mixer: Oh, sure; they're interracial. Then they have all sorts of creative groups. They have a creative art expression group, and they have a yoga class that meets there, and they have a number of other things, a meditation group. Then, of course, they have this great body of programs of working in the West Oakland area -- it's called SWOP, Student West Oakland Project. They have a Union City project, where they're working with Mexican-American families. I think that in time this too will pass to the University as a function. You see increasingly the ASUC getting into these student participation projects in the communities.

Mixer: Indeed, now it's going to become part of the curricula, you see. We're proposing -- we may not get it instituted on the Berkeley campus -- an institute whose concern would be race and community relations. One aspect of the second half of this title is an interaction program in the community between the University and the surrounding community.

Nathan: Now would this be brought about through the Board of Educational Development?

Mixer: No, this is outside of it. This happens to be through a group of people who are concerned with these problems in the school of social welfare, and the departments of education and sociology.

Nathan: And it would be Race and Community Relations?

Mixer: That is the proposed title of this institute. It hasn't yet been finally approved, not even funded.

Nathan: Is there anything else that you would like to say either about the campus scene or about your fund function?

Mixer: Well, I really don't have any more time. There's a lot you can say, but there's the limitation of time.

Nathan: Well, this is all then, and I thank you very much.

Mixer: Glad to do it.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS FUTURE
(Interview 3 -- June 11, 1971)

Nathan: Let's talk a moment about the role the University has played in the state. I think you were talking earlier about the kinds of students that it has attracted.

Mixer: Yes. The University, from a historical point of view, being the only major public institution of higher education in the state for many years of course, was the focus of students who were extremely capable and who wished to improve their lot socially, economically and politically.

Thus, over the years they became the leaders of the state in many, many areas. Today with the tremendous expansion of students going on to higher education, the number of the students at the University is small relatively, but still very significant because of their capabilities, and the qualities that they bring -- their interests and aspirations.

For example, the kinds of students who come

Mixer: to the University today are not greatly different, I believe, than they were years ago, except that they do reflect the improved environment of the State of California. The state colleges and the community colleges are really offering major opportunities for education beyond the high school for other, different social and economic strata of people.

The one notable exception is the emphasis the University has placed on minority students in the last five to six years, where the percentage of minority students, except Asian students, has increased dramatically. I've put in the exception with regard to Asian students because they always were a significant minority on this campus. I can recall in my student days, the large number of Japanese-American students who were here at Cal and indeed when I was living at the student co-op I roomed with two of them.

The University has made a tremendous contribution to the growth of the state, to the economic development of it and to the status of the state, through contributions that its students have made and the knowledge that's come out of it.

It is diminishing in political importance because of the sheer fact of the numbers of students

Mixer: going on to other institutions and not to Cal, but one of the strategic efforts of President Clark Kerr was to make sure that the University retained the professional schools and the advanced degrees. He wisely saw that the future leaders of the state would probably come from law schools, from medical schools and other professional areas. And so he fought very hard (and won) to have that type of education retained by the University in the differentiation of function within the Master Plan between the various types of institutions such as: the university, the state colleges, the community colleges.

Nathan: Your philosophy of the role of the University is really crucial and very important, especially at this time when, as you're suggesting, this is all changing. You're saying that you think the University's political influence may be somewhat diminished or at least its importance to politicians. Is there any way that you can see that the University might at least retain whatever status it now has, or any way that it can improve its status with the policy makers of the state government?

Costs and the Leadership Position

Mixer: It's going to be very difficult for the University to retain its leadership position for the simple reason that within the state and indeed in higher education throughout the nation the costs have increased dramatically, while the resources have increased less rapidly and the ceiling is being reached. And so, the University remains as a high-cost institution because of its quality and functions. In terms of professors that we have, the research that's undertaken, the specialization that's provided, the types of professional education, all of these elements too, make the University of California a higher cost institution than the state colleges, and certainly much higher than the community colleges.

This is not true however, of the per student unit cost at the lower division level. We tend to have a reasonable per student cost for the lower division students, which equates well with the state colleges. But, as the students progress to the upper division and of course to the graduate school, the costs skyrocket. And indeed,

Mixer: I feel it's a justified warning that it's going to be awfully hard to compete effectively for limited state resources and with other social needs.

So, this means that the University will have a difficult time in maintaining its stature and status in the future other than the innate sense of pride that many citizens of the state of California have in having one of the two best educational institutions in the nation located here, and its being an "institution of the people."

Of course, one of the problems pointed out by Clark Kerr is that the professional nature of the faculty and of our institution led the public to believe that they have created a meritocracy of which they cannot be a part, without exceptional abilities or efforts. They feel that the University thus has set itself up as a somewhat independent uncontrolled organization or social institution that reserves unto itself its own government, supervision and maintenance. They feel that as voters they must question whether or not it is really an instrument of the State of California.

Funds for Student Aid

Nathan: How do you reconcile these two apparently valid demands on the University? One, merit and quality and the other one, an openness to the largest possible access to those who want to come.

Mixer: Well, the cutting edge as always, is the differentiation made upon ability. The University is not open to everyone in the state. It's open only by the master plan specifications to the top twelve and one half percent of the students graduating from California high schools. So, the Master Plan itself built in the meritocracy and hierarchy of human talent for the University. And it must serve all students who have this talent. That means that if you assume, what seems to be reasonably proven, that intelligence is randomly distributed throughout the population regardless of social and economic status and background or race, then we must as an institution make it possible for those who do not have the funds to come to the University.

Nathan: That seems to be an increasing problem, doesn't it?

Mixer: Sure. And the difficulty is that the cost of the University is not just the out-of-pocket cost to a

Mixer: student and his family for tuition and the additional expense of room and board away from home, plus books and fees. It's also the income that the student foregoes when he comes to the university. This is extremely important to the lower income families. They're the ones who rely upon their offspring to add to the income of the family and they are the ones who are the least willing to go into debt for the sake of higher education because they have a natural wariness of obligations. Also they have a vivid history of their own experiences in not having steady employment so they have great concern over not being able to repay debts.

So, if there are not grants, scholarships and work-study opportunities available in the University for the lower income students, they will not come. And the state must take responsibility for training these kinds of individuals.

Nathan: Is it your impression that the Legislature is willing to support a program of grants, scholarships and work-study funds or is it disinterested in this aspect of the University's financial problems?

Mixer: I think the Legislature is interested in young people. It is interested in the traditional American political-

Mixer: economic ethic of "opportunity for all," and does want to reward proven ability. The Legislature is, of course, influenced by the public's reaction to student disruptions and by the lack of faith that the public feels in the University and that its faculty and students have shown to them in their conduct in these recent years.

This is a product of the student disruption that's had a very serious impact on the University.

Nathan: I suppose one should also mention the state administration, since that seems to be the area of greatest estrangement at the moment.

Mixer: Well, certainly the governor was elected for his first term on a campaign that emphasized cleaning up student disruptions. He has continued to use that as an issue, but not as strenuously in his re-election. So, consequently, his visibility in the media has made the issue of student disruption more vivid in the minds of the public. The governor has vetoed all "equal opportunity" bills passed by the Legislature which would have greatly aided minority students.

Slowdown in the Growth Rate

Nathan: In the light of these mental sets that you have been describing, do you now think that the University is or is not going to expand very much more? That is, in physical size and in the total number of students that it can accommodate, how do you read the signs?

Mixer: The expansion in higher education is going to come in the lower cost institutions and in those institutions which provide opportunities for immediate occupational advancement through specialized training. This means that the state colleges and more particularly, the community colleges will grow. Growth projections of the University have been curtailed dramatically by President Hitch in recognition of this factor and also in recognition of the higher costs of the University.

And so, the University here, and indeed the major four-year institutions throughout the country are going to increase slightly, say twenty-five to fifty percent over what they are now in terms of numbers of students handled. But that's not the same rate of growth of the last decade which saw a hundred percent increase in the number of students and a hundred percent increase or even

Mixer: more in the amount of financing that was made available.

Priorities and Effectiveness

Nathan: I suppose this then, would suggest a reordering of priorities within the University budget by the University itself.

Mixer: Oh, absolutely. There's going to be a tremendous readjustment as the institution rethinks its priorities. The whole question of what the University produces and how well it produces it, is going to be thrust upon us.

The Legislature and the governor are asking, "What do we get for our money?" We have to demonstrate our contributions to the welfare of the state beyond just the mere fact of numbers of degrees. I think it was Clark Kerr who stated recently through his Carnegie Commission studies that the efficiency in other words, the productivity of education, has not changed; while the costs have escalated and the resources available are declining, or rather are increasing but at a declining rate. So, therefore you have increased costs of productivity

Mixer: and less gain in income, and you become a very high cost institution.

Nathan: How do you measure these things such as effectiveness? Is it possible to measure them?

Mixer: There are a number of pioneering efforts being made to suggest measurements of outputs, not just in terms of student credit hours or degrees or the number of people who have gone through the doors of the institution, and they will require longterm studies. Immediate studies will be in terms of the length of time it takes a student to get a degree, particularly in the graduate area, the attitudes of professors and students about their educational activities and experiences -- these will have to be tested and measured. There will be a lot of subjective viewpoints that will be set up and tested in the future. What I mean is, the elements comprising these viewpoints will be identified and they will be used as standard attitude measurements in terms of sense of accomplishment.

People are making judgments now about whether or not the University is effective or efficient or worthwhile. But they're making them wholly without any objective measurements. Many people dislike the term "objective measurements" for education, but since the decisions are being made anyhow, we might

Mixer: as well get to work as administrators and faculty and set up the criteria ourselves, lest we be judged by criteria which we think are completely incompatible with the principles of quality education.

Nathan: Is this process going on presently?

Mixer: It is, but in a very small center within the University, namely, the president's office -- office of planning and analysis. The biggest difficulty, of course, is to get the University personnel to sit down and be willing to analyze what they do in relationship to some kind of yardsticks or measurements.

They're not about to do that at the present time, but the decreasing absolute amount of budgets for the Berkeley campus for example, in the last four years, the lack of salary increases, the diversion of resources to the other institutions, the drive by the state colleges to be named universities, will all focus on this need to tell our story and justify it in a more effective manner.

This means that we have to provide some rather specific notions of what our outputs are and what our contribution to society is. President Sproul long ago saw this as the essential ingredient of the University's importance to the state, and he sold quality to the Legislature even during the

Mixer: Depression, on the basis that it was productive to the economy, and the state could not afford to be without it.

Over and over again, he stated to people his thesis that you must support quality where you find it. Then of course, he offered the University in the next breath as the quality institution. So, he was very astute in this and he created this concept and got this momentum going. He saw that one of the most specific areas in which the University could demonstrate its competence was in the scientific area; thus he made tremendous efforts to get state and private funding, as well as federal funding for scientific activities. This resulted in the early gifts of the Rockefeller Foundation for Professor Ernest Lawrence and his work at the radiation laboratory.

I don't know if I covered this point of the role and the future of the University to your satisfaction.

The Significance of Private Funding

Nathan: This is very illuminating. Let's pursue it just a

Nathan: bit further in connection with your job as gifts and endowments officer. Do you find certain aspects of the University's activities being more appealing to potential donors than others? If so, what is it that they seem to be more willing to support and what do they seem less willing to support in a personal way?

Mixer: Donors are influenced by public attitudes and the volume of comments in the press as well as by other individuals. Donors are voters. They just happen to be people who have more affluence and can afford beyond their vote to provide us with funds.

But it is interesting to me that in many instances, donors retain a keen interest in helping able young people advance themselves and move ahead.

Nathan: Well, this suggests that the scholarship aid is still important.

Mixer: The scholarship and student aid is still important and it goes back to long held views that the donors have about what the essential nature of the political and social scheme of things is in this country. Mainly, they think that we are a land of opportunity and they want to help able young people who would be willing to advance themselves if funds were provided.

With respect to the University's future in the State of California, I feel quite strongly that

Mixer: it will have to expand its support from private sources and rely on those types of funds for a small but very significant portion of the University's activities. The private donor, who at times is seen as having specific interests and prejudices, viewpoints, partisan attitudes, is nevertheless an entity in the University's financial structure that gives it flexibility and independence.

In other words, donors can contribute to those activities that the state will not finance; they can support programs that may be politically delicate and cannot be undertaken willingly by the Legislature, and that are at the same time important to the society in which the University conducts itself. Therefore, if we do not adopt a policy, a strong policy, of pluralistic support of the University, we then face a future in which the options for scholarly activities may become narrowed.

It is in this realm that the private donor can make a tremendous contribution, literally in terms of dollars and figuratively in terms of the areas of subject matter and items that the donor supports.

One of the criticisms leveled at the increasing federal support of higher education is that it may

Mixer: and indeed, in the past has strongly influenced the direction that higher education takes. Nevertheless, that influence has been in line with national policies, with national needs and concerns, such scientific research following the advent of Sputnik, and in terms of agricultural research, following the Civil War. Efforts in the arts and mechanics were needed too -- by the expanding country. The federal government established the land-grant colleges that provided a tremendous intellectual growth and expertise in areas that made possible the development of our country.

So, while there may be these directions forced upon the University by the sources of support, when the sources themselves are varied, the University has greater opportunity and flexibility to undertake the things that it sees to be important.

And as many people, for instance, Chancellor Heyns and others before him have said, the University is not only a conservator of the culture of our society but it is an innovator and a critic of our society and it's in the latter two capacities that it needs the flexibility and the freedom to pursue its aims in an impartial, scholarly and wholly objective fashion.

Nathan: This, perhaps suggests that some public education is needed. One does often hear the comment, "The University is a public institution and it is up to the state government to support these projects. Why should I as a private donor make a contribution?" I think you made a very interesting case.

Limitations on State Support

Mixer: Yes, it is not only from the positive point of view, but also from a point of view of the limitation on the state's resources or the limitation on the amount of the state funds and the competing demands of other social needs of the state. As I've said earlier, the state has consistently narrowed the fields, the items which it will support for capital improvement or for current operating expenses. To repeat myself somewhat -- where they in the past financed the auditoriums and gymnasiums and public facilities, such as student centers or unions -- they no longer do that. This is now an obligation placed upon the students or on private donors.

Nathan: Does the limitation provide primarily for classroom or laboratory space, library space, that kind of thing?

Mixer: Right. The standard areas of support are faculty salaries, administrative operations, classroom and laboratory facilities and some limited amount of research.

The extensive research that the University has carried out in the past has been overwhelmingly financed by the federal government, and by many major private sources, such as the large professional research foundations such as Carnegie, Rockefeller, Danforth and others. This means that the state has circumscribed the areas of its activities and we as an institution must look to other sources.

Flexibility: Challenges and Problems

Nathan: Do you see this increasing tendency towards flexibility in admissions as having some important repercussions? I'm thinking now of moves to make it easier for people to return to the campus either after having taken time out to raise a family or to change a profession or to come in the University at a greater age than normal entry age. Am I right in thinking there is more flexibility there?

Mixer: Yes. There's much more thinking being done about this. The actual changes have yet to be fully

Mixer: enacted. However it is predictable, and I think the University will respond to this notion that education is a life-long process and that people change their vocational and intellectual interests over a lifetime and indeed it's profitable and important for them to maximize their prior education by returning at various times.

This is certainly going to come. It does though, have important ramifications for the financial end of it, and the whole operation of the University. For example, suppose there is a concept that a degree from the University of California can be awarded based upon an examination taken by an individual who has perhaps never set foot in a classroom in the year in which he's being examined, but he has done the reading, or the studies, wholly on his own. If that process comes about as it has in the State University of New York, it raises critical questions about what is the educational process, and how do people learn? What is the importance of the classroom and of research and of the typical structure and formulas for teaching and learning? So, it will make the University justify and redefine the importance of its contribution and mission in the actual educational process.

Mixer: And this again, is going to come back to the earlier question about the notion of what are the outputs of the University? What is required? If you're talking about outputs, of course you must also at the same time talk about the inputs -- and in the case I described, the degree by examination, there are no inputs by the University. Merely an examination and certification of the competence of the individual.

I think this whole thing is coming and I do feel that in the learning process, man as a social creature does benefit and responds better in a social environment with other individuals. There never is going to be a complete elimination of the need for the group process in education. However, we're just going to have to define and defend it better.

Nathan: This situation that you described, would be perhaps, the extreme, wouldn't it?

Mixer: Oh yes. Sure.

Nathan: One might obtain a certain number of credits, let's say for life experience or other activities.

Mixer: Right. But the concept ranges all the way back to the existing four year course of study that is the current practice. But between the ranges there are

Mixer: all sorts of forms of restraining or re-education or new education or continuing education, however it may be described. I think that it's one of exciting opportunities for the University.

It may be that it will provide the University an opportunity to be of greater service to a far broader number of individuals at much less cost, because the University doesn't have to make physical space available in quite as concentrated a form.

Nathan: Perhaps increasing library facilities and fewer classroom facilities are something of that nature. Can institutions reform themselves?

Mixer: It's difficult because people get certain ways of doing things and they feel comfortable in that way and they feel threatened and insecure when changes come about. I think if it's done with care and consideration for the stability of the institution and with consideration of the appropriateness of the reward system, in terms of income, tenure and retirement, it will come about. But it's not going to be a quick easy, overnight process. Institutions of higher education are among the most conservative about their own business while at the same time they're the most radical about other people's

Mixer: business. And this has been established as a factor in order to assure that the scholar was free to be critical of his environment without jeopardizing his own position. Otherwise the scholarship would get warped by the fear or the problem of the scholar's losing his position or losing his capacity to be an instructor.

But this doesn't mean that the security is so inviolable that there shouldn't be changes. There must be improvements. There must be more effective means and we have to be able to evaluate ourselves as to how effective we are. When it comes down to a department chairman asking a professor, "What have you done to improve your teaching process?" this is going to be a rude shock to many members of the academic community.

Nathan: Well, you have a pretty colorful crystal ball. Thank you very much for this sight into it.

INDEX -- Joseph R. Mixer

Anderson, Leila, 70

ASUC

Welfare Council, 1-3, 5, 23

Block, Jack, 15

Carter, Edward W., 62

Centennial Fund, 28, 50-68

Student Advisory Committee, 28

Cleaver, Eldridge, 32-35, 48

Davis, Bill, 2, 20, 73

Deutsch, Monroe, 18-19

Fisher, Ralph, 2

Free Speech Area - Sather Gate, 25-30

Kerr Rules, 30-31

Gifts and Endowments, Office of, 68

Grant, Jim, 5

Heyns, Chancellor Roger, 56, 97

Hitch, President Charles, 46

Itano, Harvey, 73

Johnston, Marguerite, 16-20

Kerr, President Clark, 30-31, 41, 55, 62, 86, 91

Kingman, Harry, 2, 70

Majors, O. Cort, 56

Malcolm X, 34

Master Plan for Higher Education, 84, 87

McPherson, John, 13-14

Muscatine, Charles, 40

Muscatine Report, 40

Newton, Huey, 48
North, Doug, 16

Priestly, Ken, 21

Race Relations, 70-80

Sherman, Lily Margaret, 70
Slaughter, Glenn, 2-3, 16
Sontag, Professor Raymond, 54
Sproul, Robert Gordon, 43, 93
Stone, Dean Hurford, 21
Stone, Professor Robert, 10-11
Strong, Professor Edward, 11, 56
Student

Housing

Committee Report, 16-17
Co-ops in 1940's, 8-9
The 1960's, 52-54
Issues, 23
Japanese Women's Student Club, 76-79
Needs, 55, 87-89, 99
Political campaigning, 14-16
Radicals, 26-27
Responses to unrest, 66-67
Responses to World War II, 1-3

Tigar, Mike, 58

University

Community Relations, 41
Financing, 50, 61, 93, 94ff.
Growth, 90
Nature of, 36-38, 97.
Urban Crisis, 46-48.

Welborn, John, 28-29
Wharton, Joe, 28-29
White, Dr. Harvey, 36-37

YMCA-YWCA

Free Speech, 71
Race Relations, 70-80
Stiles Hall, 2-3, 5, 71-74

Harriet Siegel Nathan

Graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1941 with an A.B. in Journalism. Was assistant women's editor and managing editor of The Daily Californian, then known as the Monarch of the College Dailies. Prepared President Sproul's biennial report to the legislature, 1942-44; wrote advertising copy; edited house journals; served on local and state boards of the League of Women Voters, primarily in the fields of local and regional government and publications. Returned to U.C. for a Master of Journalism degree in 1965. Wrote for the University's Centennial Record. Now doing research, writing, and editing for the Institute of Governmental Studies, U.C., Berkeley.

